

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 5 and 7 to 29 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 24 and 29 are independent.¹ Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1 to 5, 7, 8, 17 to 21 and 24 to 28 were rejected over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0138331 (Hosea); claims 9 to 11 and 13 to 16 were rejected over Hosea in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,625,803 (Massena); claim 12 was rejected over Hosea in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,525 (Muthuswamy); and claims 22, 23 and 29 were rejected over Hosea in view of U.S. Patent Publication no. 2002/0083123 (Freedman). As shown above, Applicants have amended the claims to define the invention with greater particularity. In view of these amendments, withdrawal of the art rejections is respectfully requested.

Amended independent claim 1 defines a computer-implemented method that comprises scanning content of a source page in which a component is to be inserted, where the source page is expressed in mark-up code, and obtaining a profile from the content of the source page, where the profile identifies a style of the content of the source page. The method also includes generating a content component that is to be included in the source page in accordance with the profile. Generating includes formatting the content component in accordance with the profile so that a style of the content component comports substantially to a style of the source page.

The applied art is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 1, particularly with respect to generating a content component that is to be included in the source page in accordance with the profile, where generating the content component includes formatting

¹ The Examiner is urged to independently confirm this recitation of pending claims.

the content component in accordance with the profile so that a style of the content component comports substantially to a style of the source page.

More specifically, Hosea is directed to a method of personalizing Web pages comprised of content components. Hosea is not directed to generating the content components themselves, as is the invention of claim 1. Furthermore, Hosea's method personalizes Web pages in accordance with a user's profile and in accordance with the profile of an HTML file for the Web page (as correctly noted on page 3 of the Office Action). The user's profile includes demographic and psychographic information relating to the user (paragraph 0013). The HTML file profile includes rating assigned to content components of the HTML page (paragraph 0043). The user and HTML profiles are used to arrange content on a Web page that may be of particular interest to the user as described, e.g., in paragraphs 0046 and 0051.

As correctly noted in the Office Action, the content "may also be modified so that the font color and other graphics properties are changed". Thus, while Hosea does describe the ability to change font color and graphics, there is no indication in Hosea that this is done in order to make the content comport to a style of a source page. In this regard, there is no indication in Hosea that the style of a host page is identified in its HTML profile and that the font color and other graphics properties are changed in accordance with the HTML profile so that a style of the content component comports substantially to a style of the source page. That is, paragraph 0046 merely indicates that personalization component 124 has the ability to change font color and graphics. It does not say that the font color and other graphics properties are changed in accordance with the HTML profile (the alleged counterpart to claim 1's profile).

The remaining applied art is also not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be patentable.

Amended independent claims 24 and 29 are media and apparatus claims, respectively, that roughly correspond to claim 1. These claims are also believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons set forth above.

Each of the dependent claims is also believed to define patentable features of the invention. Each dependent claim partakes of the novelty of its corresponding independent claim and, as such, has not been addressed specifically herein.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney can be reached at the address shown below. All telephone calls should be directed to the undersigned at 617-521-7896.


Applicants : Donald M. Kosak, et al.
Serial No. : 09/803,540
Filed : March 9, 2001
Page : 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 10984-535001
Client Ref.: P257

No additional fees are believed to be due for this Amendment (save for an extension fee); however, if any additional fees are due including, but not limited to, claims fees and extension fees, please charge them to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 10984-535001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 21, 2006



Paul A. Pysher
Reg. No. 40,780

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906